

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Final Office Action dated July 6, 2006, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on October 6, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-20 stand pending in the application and are shown above. Claims 1-20 are rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1, 9, 10, 12-15, and 17-19 have been canceled, and claims 2, 11, and 16 have been written in independent form. Claims 2-8, 11, 16, and 20 will now remain pending following entry of this response.

Request to Withdraw Finality

According to section 706.07(a) of the M.P.E.P, subsequent actions on the merits shall be final, except where the examiner introduces a new ground of rejection that is not necessitated by Applicants' amendment of the claims. While the independent claims were amended in the last response, the amendments did not necessitate the new ground of rejection. The new ground of rejection is based on the Examiner's statement that *Tanaka et al.* in view of *Sato et al.* do not teach at least a portion of substrate support base outside of the intermediate substrate support ridge fabricated from a dielectric material having a lower dielectric constant than a remaining portion of the substrate support base. However, this element was not added to claims 2-8, 11, 16, and 20 by the previous clarifying amendment, but rather was inherently present in these original claims. Having the portion of the substrate support base within the support ridge fabricated from a metallic material and the portion of the substrate support base outside of the intermediate substrate support ridge fabricated from a dielectric material is more limiting and within the scope of the dielectric material having a lower dielectric constant than a remaining portion of the substrate support base. Therefore, the final rejection of claims 2-8, 11, 16, and 20 is premature, and applicants respectfully request withdrawal of its finality.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12-15, and 17-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of *Satoh et al.* (US PG PUB No. 2002/0162630) and *Ke et al.* (US patent No. 6,284,093). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Applicants have canceled claims 1, 10, 12-15, and 17-19, thereby obviating rejection of these claims. Regarding claims 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8, *Tanaka* in view of *Satoh* and *Ke* do not teach, show, or suggest a substrate support base, wherein at least a portion of the substrate support base outside of the intermediate substrate support ridge is fabricated from a dielectric material as recited from claim 2. Rather, *Ke* teaches the dielectric material resides in a dielectric shield or collar 30 that “rests on and covers the top surface of the cathode which is outside the perimeter of the wafer 20” (col. 5 lines 20-22). This dielectric shield 30 of *Ke* is removable and can be replaced by another dielectric shield (col. 2 lines 1-3), and therefore, the shield 30 is not a fabricated part of the substrate support base.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 2, 11, and 16, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

Claims 4, 7, 11, 16, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of *Satoh et al.* (US PG PUB No. 2002/0162630) and *Ke et al.* (US patent No. 6,284,093) as applied to Claims 3, 6, 15 and further in view of and *Martin* (US patent No. 4,676,193). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection.

Tanaka in view of *Satoh* and *Ke*, and further in view of *Martin* do not teach, show, or suggest a substrate (reticle) support base, wherein at least a portion of the substrate (reticle) support base outside of the intermediate substrate (reticle) support ridge is fabricated from a dielectric material as recited from claims 2, 11, and 16. As described

above, *Ke* teaches the dielectric material resides in a removable dielectric shield or collar 30, which is not a fabricated part of the support base.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that independent claims 2, 11, and 16, as well as those claims that depend therefrom, are allowable and respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.


Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Tanaka et al.* (US Patent No. 5,688,358) in view of *Sato et al.* (US PG PUB No. 2002/0162630) and *Ke et al.* (US patent No. 6,284,093) as applied to Claim 1 and further in view of *Uchino et al.* (EP Pub. No. EP 1115140). Applicants have canceled claim 9, thereby obviating rejection of this claim.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, do not teach, show or suggest the invention as claimed.

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Keith M. Tackett
Registration No. 32,008
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicants